

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

---

JASON ALAN EARLS,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

SHERIFF LEONARD JOHNSON,

*Defendant.*

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
5:22-cv-00436-TES-MSH

---

ORDER ADOPTING THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

---

Before the Court is the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (R&R) [Doc. 60] regarding Defendant Sheriff Leonard Johnson's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 20]. In the R&R, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court grant Defendant Johnson's Motion because "Plaintiff cannot show that the deficiencies in administration of his diabetes medication caused him harm" and because "Eleventh Amendment immunity bars [this] suit[] for money damages against Defendant in his official capacity." [Doc. 60, pp. 21, 25]. Plaintiff filed a timely Objection [Doc. 62] to the R&R. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

When a party objects to an R&R, the Court must "make a de novo determination of those portions" of the R&R to which the party objected. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). All other portions of the R&R are reviewed for clear error. *Id.* § 636(b)(1)(A). However,

when a party's objections are "[f]rivolous, conclusive, or general," the district court need not consider them. *United States v. Schultz*, 565 F.3d 1353, 1361 (11th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (quoting *Marsden v. Moore*, 847 F.2d 1536, 1548 (11th Cir. 1988)).

In his Objection, Plaintiff states that Defendant Johnson is "trying to hide behind laws he is sworn to uphold and protect" and that Plaintiff is "still waiting to get into the law library to get some help on the forms [he] need[s] to request the proper documents from Jackson [State Prison]." [Doc. 62]. Plaintiff does not state why he believes the magistrate judge's recommendations are erroneous or contrary to law, and nothing in Plaintiff's Objection convinces the Court that the magistrate judge's recommendations are incorrect. *See [id.]*; [Doc. 60]. Thus, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections are "[f]rivolous, conclusive, or general," and reviews the R&R for clear error only. [Doc. 62]; [Doc. 60]; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) *in connection with* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1) & (d).

Finding no error, the Court **ADOPTS** the magistrate judge's R&R [Doc. 60] and **MAKES IT THE ORDER OF THE COURT**. Accordingly, because Plaintiff cannot prove causation and because Eleventh Amendment immunity bars Plaintiff's claims, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant Johnson's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 20].

**SO ORDERED**, this 11th day of June, 2024.

S/ Tilman E. Self, III  
**TILMAN E. SELF, III, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**